

REMARKS

In accordance with this supplemental response, claim 35 has been amended to recite that the sample is a wafer. As originally presented, claim 35 recited that the liquid metal ion beam irradiation means is a focused liquid metal ion beam device; however, base claim 19 is a method claim that does not recite a liquid metal ion beam irradiation means. To correct this obvious error, claim 35 has been amended to recite that the sample is a wafer.

Claim 35 patentably distinguishes over the prior art for the reasons advanced in the prior response with respect to base claim 19.

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and passage of the application to issue are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ADAMS & WILKS
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Bruce L. Adams
Reg. No. 25,386


17 Battery Place
Suite 1231
New York, NY 10004
(212) 809-3700

MAILING CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: MS AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated below.

Thomas Tolve

Name



Signature

April 10, 2007

Date